DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 180 418 HE 012 196

AUTHOR Neff, Charles B.; Nyquist, Thomas E.
TITLE Faculty Retraining. Final Report of the Faculty Retraining Project. State University of New York.
INSTITUTION State Univ. of New York, Albany.
SPONS AGENCY Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Nov 79
GRANT G007603839
NOTE 73p.
AVAILABLE FROM SUNY Faculty Retraining Program, State University of New York, State University Plaza, Albany, NY 12246

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Career Change; *College Faculty; Declining Enrollment; Educational Programs; *Faculty Development; Financial Support; Grants; Guidelines; Higher Education; *Inservice Education; Professional Training; Retrenchment; *State Universities; Success Factors; Tenure
IDENTIFIERS *Faculty Retraining; *State University of New York

ABSTRACT

The State University of New York Program on Faculty Retraining is described. Retraining is defined as preparation to move from one academic field to another or from one subfield of a discipline to another. It is distinguished from faculty development, involving the acquisition of new skills or knowledge applicable to one's ongoing responsibilities. Faculty retraining is viewed as an opportunity for faculty in areas of low and declining enrollments to retrain in related or subdisciplines of growing or high enrollment. The Retraining Program has attracted faculty ranging in age from 28 to 58 from various professional and degree levels. The costs and funding procedures for the program are examined as well as application and acceptance process. Evaluations from administrators of participating campuses, and from faculty who have completed retraining indicate that the process has provided additional flexibility to colleges and universities confronted by the economics of retrenchment, declining enrollment, and high tenure ratios. It is suggested that retraining is most successful where clear guidelines are established at the outset, where it satisfies both the personal needs of faculty and institution, and where there is a good fit between the extent of career change and the length of the retraining program. Some sample questionnaires are included. Appended are guidelines for application, names of participating SUNY campuses, host campuses for retraining, faculty retraining grants awarded, a statistical summary, an outside evaluation, and articles and papers on the SUNY Retraining Program. (Author/SF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED180418

Faculty Retraining

Final Report of the Faculty Retraining Project

State University of New York

with support of the
Fund for Improvement of Postsecondary Education

November 1979

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Thomas E. Wagner

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 012 196

FINAL REPORT

SUNY FACULTY RETRAINING PROGRAM

Grant #G007603839

July, 1976 - June, 1977	$21,746
July, 1977 - June 1978	$62,000
July, 1978 - June 1979	$71,446

Submitted to:

Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Office of Education
Washington, D.C.

Submitted by:

Charles B. Neff, Associate Vice Chancellor
Project Director
Thomas E. Nyquist, Coordinator
State University of New York
State University Plaza
Albany, New York
12246
(518) 473-1835

CONTENTS

	Page
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK - GENERAL STATEMENT	iv
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
Project Overview	1
Purpose	1
Background and Origin	1
Project Description	2
Outcome and Impact	2
Summary and Conclusions	3
NARRATIVE	4
Project Overview	4
Purpose	5
Background and Origin	5
Project Description	5
Participating Campuses: Home	5
Host Campuses	8
Selection of Candidates	9
Guidelines for Selection of Candidates	10
Types of Applications	11
Characteristics of Applicants	11
Retraining Funding	12
Retraining Costs	12
Outcomes and Impact	14
Summary and Conclusions	14

TABLES

Table 1 - Participating Campuses, Submissions and Approvals Through June 1979	6
Table 2 - Applications Approved	7
Table 3 - Host Campuses for Retraining	8
Table 4 - Age at Time of Application for Retraining	13
Table 5 - Education Attained and Professional Level	13

APPENDICES

	Page
Appendix A - Guidelines for Application of Retraining	16
Appendix B - Guidelines for Application of Mini-Grant Retraining	27
Appendix C - Names of Participating SUNY Campuses	37
Appendix D - Host Campuses for Retraining	39
Appendix E - Faculty Retraining Grants Awarded	40
Appendix F - Statistical Summary	42
Appendix G - Outside Evaluation	44
Appendix H - Articles and Papers on SUNY Retraining	50

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
GENERAL STATEMENT

The State University encompasses four university centers, 14 colleges of arts and science (university colleges), six colleges and centers for the health sciences, six agricultural and technical colleges, seven specialized colleges, and 30 locally sponsored community colleges. Together, they provide students a choice of more than 3600 academic programs on 64 campuses.

The University has a wide diversity of what are considered the more conventional career fields, such as engineering, medicine, literature, dairy farming, medical technology, accounting, social work, forestry and automotive technology. Additionally, responsiveness to programs in all areas of learning and to tomorrow's developing societal needs has resulted in concentrations which include pollution, urban studies, computer science, immunology, preservation of national resources, and microbiology. Degree opportunities range from two-year associate programs to doctoral studies.

More than 350,000 students are pursuing traditional study in classrooms or are working at home through such innovative institutions as Empire State College. A distinguished faculty includes nationally and internationally recognized figures in all the major disciplines, with the University's research contributions helping to solve some of modern society's most urgent problems.

The University is governed by a Board of Trustees appointed by the Governor, which directly determines the policies to be followed by the 34 state-supported campuses. The 30 community colleges have their own boards of trustees whose relationship to the SUNY board is defined by law.

The motto of the State University is: "To Learn-To Search-To Serve."

SUNY FACULTY RETRAINING PROGRAM

State University of New York
State University Plaza
Albany, New York 12246
Charles B. Neff, Director (518) 473-1835
Thomas E. Nyquist, Coordinator (914) 257-2303

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A. Project Overview

On July 1, 1976, the State University of New York (SUNY) established the SUNY Program on Faculty Retraining* on a pilot basis, with a grant provided by the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education. Following its inception the project expanded from one linked to twelve SUNY colleges and universities in the eastern part of New York State to a statewide project involving 35 campuses--four university centers, 10 university colleges, two agricultural and technical colleges, and 19 community colleges. For those campuses that actively participated and for the faculty involved evidence suggests that most found the program both desirable and useful.

Experience would indicate that retraining is most successful where clear guidelines are established at the outset, where it satisfies both the personal needs of participating faculty and the personnel needs of the institution, where it is not viewed as an easy method of rehabilitating poor teachers, and where there is a good fit between the extent of career change and the length of the retraining program.

B. Purpose

In a period of greatly reduced budgets and high tenure ratios in traditional departments and programs, many universities and colleges are finding it increasingly difficult to accommodate new and high demand initiatives without taking such drastic actions as retrenchment. A humane and effective alternative is to provide opportunities for faculty in areas of low and declining enrollments to retrain in related disciplines or subdisciplines of growing or high enrollment.

C. Background and Origins

In 1973 SUC Plattsburg received a grant from the William H. Donner Foundation to retrain a small number of faculty in a new and multidisciplinary Canadian Studies Program. This resulted in a six month intensive study program for five persons in the disciplines of sociology, history, literature, theater and education, which rapidly and effectively

---

* Note: Retraining is defined as preparation to move from one academic field to another or from one major sub-field of a discipline to another. It is distinguished from faculty development involving the acquisition of new skills or knowledge applicable to one's on-going responsibilities.

added strength in Canadian Studies to an existing faculty. It further enabled the campus to launch during the fall of 1975 one of only two bachelor of arts degree programs in Canadian Studies in the United States. The success of this experience, and experience with bilateral negotiations between SUC Plattsburg and SUNY Albany for the introduction of a small retraining program, led the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Special Projects of SUNY and the Director of the Center for International Studies at SUC Plattsburg to seek funding for the wider application of the retraining concept within the SUNY system.

D. Project Description

The Retraining Program began as a pilot project involving 12 SUNY campuses in the eastern part of New York State--one university center, three university colleges, one agricultural and technical college, and seven community colleges. In the spring of 1977 the decision was made to make the program available to all SUNY units. By the fall of 1978, 35 campuses across the state had expressed an interest in participating in the Retraining Program. Over the period of the FIPSE funding 77 faculty applications were received after campus screening. Of these, 33 were funded. Host campuses for retraining were most often other SUNY colleges and universities, but 28 percent did go to non-SUNY campuses in New York State, and another 26 percent went out-of-state or out-of-country. There were only two of the latter.

The applications approved and funded reflected a wide variety of disciplines, but with the largest number of applicants coming from education, foreign languages and history. Almost two-fifths of the faculty did their retraining in different sub-areas of their current disciplines. A larger number did retraining with the goal of shifting partially into new disciplines. A few trained to teach totally in new disciplines. Essentially, retraining has had two thrusts: to provide a stimulus for new directions within current disciplines and to provide trained personnel to assume part-time responsibilities in related fields where there is an existing or perceived need. The statistics on areas for which faculty have retrained shows no prevailing trends, and is reflective of the needs of particular campuses.

Retraining has drawn faculty from across the spectrum of age and level. Ages have varied from 29 to 58, with the largest number in the 35-39 and 45-49 brackets. Faculty of widely differing professional and degree levels have taken part, with the largest category consisting of associate professors with doctorates.

The costs of retraining have been modest. The 33 candidates were funded at a direct cost to the retraining program of $84,062.27. In addition, there have been varying indirect costs to participating institutions such as sabbaticals, other leaves with pay, released time, reduced teaching loads, and tuition. There also have been administrative costs to the project in the form of salaries, travel and office expenses.

E. Outcomes and Impact

The Retraining Program has provided an opportunity for tenured faculty who were underutilized and who might otherwise have been retrenched to

continue to serve their campuses through the development of new knowledge and skills. It has permitted departments to use existing faculty to explore new areas, further develop existing areas, and serve the needs of students. It has given participating colleges and universities an opportunity to accommodate new and high demand initiatives without necessarily taking such drastic actions as retrenchment.

The Program has attracted interest from a variety of institutions and agencies across the United States and in Canada. Inquiries have come from five campuses in New York State not part of the SUNY system; from 25 universities, boards and offices in 11 states and the District of Columbia; from both the American Association of Colleges and the Office of Career Education in Washington, D.C., and from 15 universities and institutions in Canada. There have also been numerous requests made of the project director and the coordinator to speak at national and regional conferences. Papers have been delivered at seven such conferences. In addition, three articles have been published pertaining directly to the Program.

Recognizing the positive impact of the retraining program within SUNY, a serious effort was made to get it unto regular state funding for 1979-80. This was unsuccessful. However, the United University Professionals (UUP), which represents the SUNY faculty at the university centers, university colleges, and the agricultural and technical colleges, has secured $200,000 a year in its recent contract for the purpose of assisting retrenched faculty and other retrenched professionals to retrain. While the UUP program serves a different purpose, a number of its concepts and ideas have been drawn from the FIPSE-funded program.

F. Summary and Conclusions

Evaluations from administrators of participating campuses and from faculty who have completed retraining would indicate that retraining has achieved its primary goals of providing additional flexibility to colleges and universities confronted by reduced budgets and high tenure ratios in traditional departments and programs, and in helping tenured faculty shift into areas and disciplines where their experience and knowledge can be better utilized.

NARRATIVE

A. Project Overview

On July 1, 1976, the State University of New York (SUNY) established the SUNY Program on Faculty Retraining on a pilot basis with a grant provided by the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education. Following its inception the project expanded from one linked to twelve SUNY colleges and universities in the northeastern part of New York State to a statewide project involving 35 campuses--four university centers, 10 university colleges, two agricultural and technical colleges, and 19 community colleges.

Thirty-three tenured faculty were afforded and made use of the opportunity to retrain. However, in a system as large as SUNY, this has only begun to scratch the surface of the need for retraining among tenured faculty. Moreover, in the best of all worlds it would be desirable to offer retraining, as well, to non-tenured faculty, administrators returning to teaching, and to non-teaching faculty and professionals generally.

For those whom the Program reached, evaluations strongly suggest that it has served most well, though not all. An implicit understanding was that faculty who went through retraining would have time to prove themselves in their new area or discipline. In at least one case this was not done, with the faculty member retrenched soon after returning to his campus. In at least one other instance a retrained faculty member has not been able to utilize his retraining to the extent anticipated. A program such as retraining either succeeds or fails on the issue of fair play and adherence to agreements reached.

Experience of the Retraining Program suggests that for retraining to be most successful a number of criteria need to be met: Clear guidelines for the program must be established at the outset. The scope and goals, the criteria both as to eligibility and selection, the funding sources and amounts, and the expected outcomes of the programs must be clearly understood by faculty and administrators in order to avoid misunderstandings, confusion, and bitterness. Further it is important to satisfy the personal needs of the retrained faculty member and the personnel needs of the institution. If only the former are satisfied the retrainee may not be fully accepted by his or her colleagues. If, on the other hand, satisfying institutional needs is the primary goal, administrative coercion may occur or may be perceived to occur by the faculty. Further, retraining should not be viewed as a quick, easy method of rehabilitating poor teachers, and in fact those faculty who became involved in the SUNY retraining program were generally self-motivated individuals, eager to have an opportunity to grow professionally and personally.

Finally, it should be noted that most of the retraining in the SUNY project did not involve dramatic career changes. Few of the individuals spent more than one year in retraining, and most spent a considerably shorter period. If a major change in a faculty member's teaching responsibilities is the goal of the program, the length of retraining would have to be extended.

B. Purpose

The State University of New York faculty retraining program was established with three basic purposes in mind as spelled out in the Guidelines for Application of Retraining (see Appendix A and Appendix B).

1. To staff extant and emerging academic programs of high or growing student demand by providing opportunities for faculty of participating SUNY campuses to teach and participate in programs to which their new study relates. (In special cases funding might be given to support activities of a non-instructional nature.)

2. To permit individual campuses to respond to new and increased program needs and shifts in student interests by identifying and allowing interested faculty in disciplines where there is proportionally less demand to retrain in allied program areas where there is greater demand.

3. To provide individual campuses with a strategy for reallocation of resources which is both humane and effective and which is workable within the constraints of tenure, contracts and unionism.

C. Background and Origins

In 1973 SUC Plattsburg of the SUNY system received a grant from the William H. Donner Foundation to retrain a small number of faculty in a new and multidisciplinary Canadian Studies Program. This resulted in a six month intensive study program for five persons in the disciplines of sociology, history, literature, theater and education, which rapidly and effectively added strength in Canadian Studies to an existing faculty. It further enabled the campus to launch during the fall of 1975 one of only two bachelor of arts degree programs in Canadian Studies in the United States. The success of this experience, and experience with bilateral negotiations between SUC Plattsburg and SUNY Albany for the introduction of a small retraining program, led the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Special Projects of SUNY and the Director of the Center for International Studies at SUC Plattsburg to seek funding for the wider application of the retraining concept within the SUNY system.

D. Project Description

Participating Campuses: Home

The retraining program began as a pilot project involving twelve SUNY campuses in the northeastern part of New York State. This included one university center (SUNY Albany); three university colleges, i.e. four year institutions which offer Master's degrees in selected areas (SUC New Paltz, SUC Plattsburg and SUC Potsdam); one agricultural and technical college (Cobleskill); and seven community colleges (Adirondack Community College, Clinton Community College, Columbia-Greene Community College, Dutchess Community College, Hudson Valley Community College, Schenectady County Community College, and Ulster County Community College).

In the Spring of 1977 the decision was made to make the program available to all SUNY units. By the fall of 1978, 35 campuses, as indicated in Table 1, had expressed an interest in participating in the retraining program (see Appendix C for a complete list of campuses). These consisted of four university centers, 10 university colleges, two agricultural and technical colleges and 19 community colleges across the state.

Table 1
Participating Campuses, Submissions and Approvals
Through June 1979

	Total	Number in Project	Number of Submissions	Applications Funded
University Centers. . .	4	4	1	0
University Colleges . .	14	10	52	22
Community Colleges. . .	30	19	23	11
Agricultural and Technical Colleges. . .	6	2	1	0
Other	10	0	0	0
Total	64	35	77	33

Not all of these campuses submitted applications, however, and in some cases applications were denied for one or more reasons by the retraining advisory committee consisting of administrative representatives from participating campuses. Thus, as indicated in Table 2, 36 applications were approved during the period of the FIPSE grant from 13 campuses. This is out of a total of 77 applications submitted by 18 campuses. Three of the 36 applications were not funded, however. One person left the SUNY system before beginning retraining, another could not begin retraining at the scheduled time, and a third received all his funding from his home campus in the form of a sabbatical with salary.

Two-thirds of the submissions have come from university colleges and almost all of the remainder from the community colleges. Funded applications, as noted in Table 1, are reflective of this. As a group the university colleges and community colleges in SUNY have been suffering from tighter budget restrictions and greater enrollment problems. With generally high tenure ratios as an additional problem for a number of these institutions, the need for flexibility and for viable alternatives to the trauma of retrenchment of tenured faculty is greater than at either the university centers or the agricultural and technical colleges. Moreover, the higher level of specialization found at university centers makes retraining more difficult to achieve within a limited time. There are indications, too, of a strong faculty and departmental reaction at the centers to retraining and retrained faculty, with questions of competency raised. These are issues at other campuses, as well, but of a lesser magnitude. As pertains to the agricultural and technical colleges, the need for retraining has not been very apparent yet, with enrollments holding up well. Tighter operating budgets, higher tenure ratios and rather grim demographic figures in New York State on future college enrollments may well change this.

Table 2 June 30, 1979

Applications Approved

College	Spring 1977	Fall 1977	Spring 1978	Summer 1978 (Mini-grants)	Fall 1978	Spring 1979	Total
SUC Brockport		4	4[a]		1		9
Broome Community College					1		1
SUC Buffalo			2		1		3
Cayuga County Comm. College						1	1
Clinton Community College	1						1
Dutchess County Comm. College	3						3
Genesee County Comm. College					1		1
Hudson Valley Comm. College	1						1
SUC New Paltz	1	1	1		1[c]		4
Niagara County Comm. College			2				2
SUC Plattsburg	2		2		2		6
SUC Potsdam		1[b]			2		3
Tompkins/Cortland Comm. College				1			1
Total	8	6	11	1	9	1	36

a - One of the faculty approved for retraining left and was not funded.
b - The faculty member was unable to adjust plans for retraining when scheduled and was not funded.
c - This faculty member, while approved, asked for no funding from the program.

Host Campuses

Host campuses for retraining have most often been other SUNY colleges and universities. As noted in Table 3, 46 percent of those faculty involved in retraining have done some or all of their retraining at SUNY campuses. This reflects a deliberate effort by the SUNY program to encourage the utilization of the rich resources of the SUNY system and to save on costs of travel and/or relocation. However, the option has been available for faculty to retrain at other institutions should they provide a good rationale for doing so. Thus, 28 percent of funded faculty during the program were approved to go outside the SUNY system, but within New York State; 20 percent to go to institutions elsewhere in the country; and 6 percent (or two people) for retraining out-of-country. These were individuals working in language areas.

Table 3
Host Campuses for Retraining

	Number	Percent
SUNY	16	46
Other New York	10	28
Out-of-State	7	20
Out-of-Country	2	6
Total	35[a]	100

a - The total applications funded were 33, but two applications fell into two categories.

As Appendix D suggests, most often faculty retraining within the SUNY system have chosen one of the university centers. This has been the case for all but two of 14 faculty. This was to be anticipated in view of the more extensive graduate offerings available at the centers. Of faculty going to non-SUNY units in New York State, most have chosen major private universities, but a few selected nearby small institutions or specialized facilities such as the Max Wienrich Institute and the Brookhaven National Laboratory. Out-of-state sites for retraining have ranged across the country, usually reflecting special retraining concerns and/or particularly strong programs offered in the areas of interest. Examples would include the United States Forest Service, Forest and Range Experimental Station, at Tempe, Arizona, selected by a faculty member pursuing personnel and human resource management; and Central Michigan University chosen for its strong "hands-on" approach to media systems training. The two faculty going

out-of-country were retraining in Spanish and French. One attended the Institute Fenix at Cuernavaca, Morelos, Mexico, and the other the Paris Institute Catholique in Paris, France. Both institutions have linkages with the SUNY system.

Selection of Candidates

The actual selection of candidates has been on a competitive basis, with the first group of candidates considered in the spring of 1977. Applications were considered each spring and fall since then, through the spring of 1979. Additionally, the concept of mini-grants was experimented with in the summer of 1978. These did not prove to be very successful. In brief, the purposes of such grants were two-fold: (1) to allow colleges to use such concepts as intensive workshops to retrain faculty on their own campuses without the added expense of relocation, extensive transportation demands, and the need for reduced teaching loads or sabbatical leaves, (2) to provide an alternative to the more extensive retraining normally required of faculty. (Appendix B provides greater detail.) Applications received were generally unsatisfactory, and only one of 11 applications was funded. This resulted in a decision to discontinue the mini-grant concept.

The selection procedure for awarding of regular grants and mini-grants has been similar. Applications are initially screened on the home campus either by a special faculty committee or by the administration - the latter mode being most common. These applications are then reviewed by the retraining project coordinator for errors and omissions, and submitted both to the project director and the overall retraining advisory committee. Until the fall of 1977, retraining was limited to the eastern part of New York State, with twelve campuses participating. During this initial period the advisory committee consisted of an administrative representative from each campus, the project coordinator, and the project director. This fourteen member committee met as a group to consider the applications. Their decisions could fall into a number of categories: outright rejection, rejection with suggestion of resubmission, tentative approval pending further information, or approval. Decisions were by majority vote of all present.

With the determination made in the summer of 1977 to open the program to all interested SUNY units, the advisory committee was reconstituted. It was decided to diminish the size of the committee slightly for purposes of efficiency and to select members who would be representative of both the expansion in the number of institutions involved and the new geographic distribution. The final membership consisted of ten participants besides the director and coordinator - an administrative representative from the university centers, two from the university colleges, and six from the community colleges. It was decided, as well, that to provide continuity some of the original members should be carried over. Consequently, in addition to the coordinator and director, five of the previous committee members were continued.

Guidelines for Selection of Candidates

The basic criteria for selection of candidates by the advisory committee has changed somewhat over the three year period of the FIPSE grant. As of June 1979 they included the following:

- Applicants will be tenured professors currently teaching.

- They must be members of a declining or low enrollment department.

- Retraining will be in an area where campus needs have increased, are increasing, or are anticipated to increase; and staffing is inadequate.

- There must be a letter from the effected department(s) approving the retraining. There should also be an indication that the department(s) have assisted the candidate in developing his program and are strongly supportive. The program should include time for the development of new courses upon resumption of teaching duties. It may consist of courses for credit, audited courses, independent or guided study, research, and collection of materials and information.

- The administration must also provide a letter supporting retraining in the new area as meeting campus needs. Where not precluded by institutional directive, such a letter should indicate full salary support during retraining. Otherwise it ought to indicate alternative support such as released time or course load reduction.

- There should be a letter from the host institution(s) indicating willingness to accept the retrainee's planned program of study. There should be an indication, as well, that his program has been prepared in conjunction with the host institution(s).

- The application narrative needs to give information on the level of commitment of the retrainee in his area of retraining. In addition, the relationship between the training program and the anticipated outcome should be carefully delineated.

- The financial request must be of a detailed nature with a justification for each item.

- Retraining must consist of at least one semester, but cannot be funded under the retraining program for more than two semesters plus two summers. The desired length specified, which is really a compromise between cost and time needed for retraining, is one semester plus summer. Where possible, retraining should be on a full-time basis for sake of learning and continuity.

- Retraining must result in substantial responsibilities in the retrainee's new area of study, normally a minimum of half-time.

- Retraining shall take place within the U.S. except with very strong justification. It is desirable that it occurs within the SUNY system or at the closest institution suitable for the proposed program.

Within the above strictures individual applications are likely to rise and fall on how feasible the proposed program seems to be, how well it is spelled out and justified, and the strength of support it has at all applicable levels.

Types of Applications

The applications approved and funded have reflected a wide variety of disciplines, as demonstrated in Appendix E. However, there are certain disciplines frequently represented--areas which have been affected by declining enrollments throughout much of the SUNY system. Most significant in total numbers are education (six), foreign languages (five), and history (four). These constitute almost half of the total funded or 45 percent. Other broad disciplinary categories in which more than one application has been funded are physical education (including health and recreation), mathematics, and physics.

Almost two-fifths (36 percent) of the faculty have done their retraining in different sub-areas of their current disciplines. A larger number (52 percent) have pursued retraining with the goal of shifting partially into a new discipline. A few (four of 33) have had programs with the end goal of shifting totally into a new discipline. In essence, retraining has had two thrusts: to provide a stimulus for new directions within existing disciplines and to provide trained personnel to assume part-time responsibilities in related disciplines where there is an existing or perceived need.

The statistics on areas for which faculty have been retraining show no pervasive trends, though certain areas do appear more than once. Three faculty have done retraining either in business administration or business law, two in reading education or special education, two in various aspects of economics, two in radio and TV, two in computer science, two in data processing, two from French language to French civilization, and two in criminal justice. These and other areas into which faculty are moving suggest a shift toward subjects of increased student interest and/or employment opportunity upon graduation. Examples would be business, computer science, criminal justice, gerentology and environmental science. This was to be expected. But the data also suggests that retraining is meeting a wide variety of departmental and institutional needs.

Characteristics of Applicants

Retraining has drawn faculty from across the spectrum. The average age of retrainees at the time of application has been 41, but with a variation in age from 29 to 58. Oddly enough, the largest number, two-thirds, fall in the brackets of 35-39 and 45-49 (see Table 4). It could be speculated that these are particular points in an individual's professional life when he or she is more ready to consider career redirection, and retraining offers an opportunity for such redirection.

Retraining has had the characteristic,as well, of attracting faculty of varying professional and degree levels. While the largest catetory has been

associate professors with doctorates (see Table 5), it is not a predominant group, and the significant number of full professors involved in retraining gives lie to the contention that more senior faculty are unwilling to consider new teaching alternatives.

Eight of the 33 successful applications (24 percent) have been women. This is fairly reflective of the percentage of women among the teaching faculty in the SUNY system (which is 21 percent in institutions other than community colleges and 31 percent among the community colleges).

The retraining application forms contain no questions on either racial or ethnic background. As a result, there are no reliable statistics on the number of minority candidates for retraining. The number is probably small, given that the retraining program is designed for tenured faculty. With the fairly recent nature of vigorous minority recruitment, a considerable percentage would not yet be tenured.

Retraining Funding

The retraining program has provided grant assistance to candidates in four areas of expenditure: relocation adjustment (applicable in instances where the retrainee would find it necessary to move temporarily to the area of the host campus), course development support (a summer stipend for preparation of new courses or other program developments excluding cost of equipment and supplies), trainee travel (especially applicable where the candidate commutes to the host campus) and books and materials. For regular retraining the initial fundings maximums established in each category were, respectively, $2000, $2000, $936, and $400, with an overall grant maximum of $5336. In the summer of 1978 the category maximums were altered to $2000, $1600, $1000 and $400. Additionally, the overall maximum one could apply for was reduced to $2000 to permit a larger number of applicants to be assisted.

The mini-grant guidelines which were implemented on March 14, 1978, and were in effect for only a brief period of time, had the following category maximums: relocation adjustment - $1000, course development support - $1000, trainee travel - $500, books and materials - $200. The overall maximum grant allowed was $2700.

Where not precluded by institutional directive, the home campuses have been asked to provide full salary support during retraining. Where this is precluded they are expected to provide alternative support such as released time or course load reduction. In addition, host campuses that are part of SUNY, have been requested to meet tuition costs when possible.

Retraining Costs

The direct cost to the retraining program for the 33 faculty funded has been $84,062.27, with $23,031.00 going for relocation, $37,966.00 for course development support, $12,733.92 for trainee travel, and $10,331.35 for books and materials. This is a mean average of $2547.34 per candidate. The actual

Table 4
Age at Time of Application for Retraining

Age	Number
25-29	1
30-34	4
35-39	13
40-44	3
45-49	9
50-54	0
55-59	3
Total	33

Table 5
Education Attained and Professional Level

	B.A. B.S.	M.A. M.S.	Ph.D. Ed.D	Total
Assistant Professor . .	1	5	5	11
Associate Professor . .	0	3	11	14
Professor	0	2	6	8
Total	1	10	22	33

size of individual grants has varied from as little as $575 to as much as $5227.32.

There are also administrative costs to the project in the form of salaries, travel, and office expenses. Salaries include a half salary for a coordinator, and a fourth salary for a secretary. Included under travel have been expenses for the director, the coordinator, other members of the advisory committee and attendance of two retraining meetings by selected faculty retrainees. Also included in travel are expenses involved in a comparative evaluation of the retraining program in New York, Pennsylvania and Wisconsin. Office expenses have consisted primarily of supplies, xeroxing, telephone and postage. Total FIPSE monies awarded for the years of 1976-77, 1977-78 and 1978-79 were $151,692. In addition to the above, there have been varying costs to participating institutions such as sabbaticals at an average of about $15,000 per recipient (including fringe benefits), other leaves with pay, released time, reduced teaching loads, office expenses, and administrative time.

E. Outcomes and Impact

The retraining program has provided an opportunity for tenured faculty who were underutilized and who might otherwise have been retrenched to continue to serve their campuses through the development of new knowledge and skills. It has permitted departments to use existing faculty to explore new areas, further develop existing areas, and serve the needs of students. It has given participating colleges and universities an opportunity to accommodate new and high demand initiatives without necessarily taking such drastic action as retrenchment.

The Program has attracted interest from a variety of institutions and agencies across the United States and in Canada. Inquiries have come from five campuses in New York State not part of the SUNY system; from 25 universities, boards and offices in 11 states and the District of Columbia; from both the American Association of Colleges and the Office of Career Education in Washington, D.C., and from 15 universities and institutions in Canada. There have been numerous requests made of the project director and the project coordinator to speak at national, regional and state conferences. Papers have been delivered at seven such conferences. In addition, four articles have been published pertaining to the program. See Appendix H for a list of articles and papers.

Recognizing the positive impact of the retraining program within SUNY, a serious effort was made to get it into regular state funding for 1979-80. This was unsuccessful. However, the United University Professionals (UUP), which represents the SUNY faculty at the university centers, university colleges, and the agricultural and technical colleges, has secured $200,000 a year in its recent contract for the purpose of assisting retrenched faculty and other retrenched professionals to retrain. While the UUP program serves a different purpose, a number of its concepts and ideas have been drawn from the FIPSE-funded program.

F. Summary and Conclusions

Evaluations from administrators of participating campuses, and from faculty who have completed retraining, would indicate that retraining has achieved its primary goals of providing additional flexibility to colleges and universities confronted by reduced budgets and high tenure ratios in

traditional departments and programs, and in helping tenured faculty shift into areas and disciplines where their experience and knowledge can be better utilized.

It should be stressed again, however, that retraining is most successful where clear guidelines are established at the outset, where it satisfies both the personal needs of participating faculty and the personnel needs of the institutions, where it is not viewed as an easy method of rehabilitating poor teachers, and where there is a good fit between the extent of career change and the length of the retraining program.

Appendix A

State University of New York
Project for Faculty Retraining

GUIDELINES FOR APPLICATION OF RETRAINING

Dr. T. Nyquist
6-28-78

NECESSARY AND DESIRABLE CRITERIA FOR PARTICIPATION IN RETRAINING

Necessary	Desirable
Tenured professor currently teaching.	
Member of a declining or low enrollment department.	
Retraining in an area where campus needs have increased, are increasing, or are anticipated to increase; and staffing is inadequate.	
Letter from effected department(s) approving the retraining.	Indication that the department(s) have assisted the candidate in developing his program and are strongly supportive.
Letter from the administration(s) supporting retraining in the new area as meeting campus needs.	Where not precluded by institutional directive, full salary support during retraining, otherewise alternative support such as released time or course load reduction.
Letter from the host institution(s) indicating willingness to accept the retrainees planned program of study.	Indication, as well, that the program has been prepared in conjunction with the host institution(s).
Information on level of committment of retrainee to area of retraining.	
	Relationship between the training program and the anticipated outcome be carefully delineated.
Detailing of financial request with justification for each item.	
An equivalent of at least one semester's retraining, but not more than two semesters plus two summers.	One semester plus summer.
Retraining will result in substantial responsibilities in new area.	At least half time duties in new areas of responsibility.
Retraining will take place within the U.S. except with very strong justification.	Retraining within the SUNY system or at the closest institution suitable for the proposed retraining.

GUIDELINES FOR THE REGULAR RETRAINING PROGRAM

A. Rationale for Retraining*

1. To staff extant and emerging academic programs of high or growing student demand by providing opportunities for faculty of participating SUNY campuses to undertake study in allied fields and return to their campuses to teach and participate in programs to which their new study relates. In special cases funding might be given to support activities of a non-instructional nature.

2. To permit individual campuses to respond to new or increased program needs and shifts in student interests by identifying and allowing interested faculty in disciplines where there is proportionately less demand to retrain in allied program areas where there is greater demand.

3. To provide individual campuses with a strategy for reallocation of resources which is both humane and effective and which is workable with the constraints of tenure, contracts and unionism.

B. Home Campus Administrative Responsibilities

1. Establish procedures for the selection of candidates for retraining.

2. Assure cooperation of affected departments where departmental transfers are involved or approval of the department where a faculty member wishes to shift from one sub-area of a department to another.

3. Select one or more candidates by November 1.

4. Submit trainee applications by November 1 to the Project Coordinator, with a cover letter supporting retraining in the new area as meeting campus needs.

5. Provide up to one semester's full salary for the faculty members, depending upon the extent of his or her retraining program.

6. Provide an annual written report summarizing the correspondence between initial campus expectations for the retraining programs and the actual impact of the programs.

C. Home Campus Departmental Responsibilities

1. Retraining encompasses a number of alternatives. It includes such possibilities as preparation for a total shift to another department, for joint assignment in one's current department and another department, for teaching in an interdisciplinary program, for teaching in a different sub-area within one's current discipline, or for work in academic support programs. The home department(s) involved should:

- -

*Note: Retraining is defined as preparation to move from one academic field to another or from one major sub-field of a discipline to another. It is to be distinguished from faculty development involving the acquisition of new skills or knowledge applicable to one's on-going responsibilities.

a. Assist the candidate in developing and implementing a program that will prepare him or her to meet the anticipated new responsibilities.

b. Spell out to the candidate specifically what these responsibilities will be.

c. Submit a letter of approval of the retraining proposal to accompany the application. There must be assurance that the goals of the proposal are acceptable to the department(s) involved.

d. Provide an evaluative report on the success of the trainee's study program six months after assumption of new responsibilities.

D. Trainee Responsibilities

1. Submit an application to the person or body on campus responsible for screening applications. Included should be a specific rationale for retraining, purposes for selecting a particular host institution, a detailed and thorough study program prepared in conjunction with the recipient department or program and with the relevant department(s) of the host campus, a financial request, and a current curriculum vitae. Attached should be a letter from the effected department(s) approving the retraining and a letter from the host institution(s) indicating willingness to accept the retrainees planned program of study. (Keep in mind the sheet on necessary and desirable criteria for participating in retraining.)

2. If accepted for retraining, follow the proposed study program, working closely with the departments of the host institution and with the recipient department or program of the home institution.

3. Upon completion of the study program, prepare a report assessing the degree to which the program has satisfied proposed goals.

4. Six months after returning to the home campus, provide a progress and evaluation report.

E. Criteria for Selection of Trainees

1. It is the presumption that applicants will meet the following criteria. Exceptions can be made, with each case judged on its merits.

a. Tenured members of faculty.

b. Membership in low or declining enrollment programs, departments or divisions.

c. Demonstrated interest in retraining in an area where enrollments have increased, are increasing, or are anticipated to increase and current staffing needs are unsatisfactory.

d. Rigorous and carefully planned program of study developed in consultation with those in the department or sub-area in which one will be working upon the completion of retraining.

F. Program of Study Guidelines

1. The planned program ideally should be one which can be accomplished within six months--summer plus one semester or vice versa, but shorter or longer periods are acceptable with reasonable justification. Where possible, this should be on a full-time basis.

2. The proposed program should include time for the development of the new courses to be taught upon resumption of teaching duties.

3. Such a program could include courses for credit, audited courses, independent or guided study, research, and collection of materials and information.

G. Financial Guidelines

1. Where the retraining is for one semester, the home campus is asked to provide full salary for the candidate. This could be done as part of a regular sabbatical or leave with pay.

2. A candidate for retraining can apply for grant assistance in any of the following categories up to the maximums noted below. Justification should be clearly indicated! But the overall request for funding cannot exceed $2000.

   a. Relocation Adjustments (applicable in instances where the applicant would find it necessary to move temporarily to the area of the host campus) $2000.00

   b. Course Development Support (a summer stipend for preparation of new courses or other program developments excluding cost of equipment and supplies) 1600.00

   c. Trainee Travel (especially applicable where the candidate commutes to the host campus). 1000.00

   d. Books and Materials 400.00

H. Guidelines for Selection of Host Campus

1. Normally retraining will be done at one of the SUNY units. This does not exclude the possibility of retraining outside the SUNY system, or outside the state.

2. Retraining may be provided on the home campus.

I. Host Campus Administrative Responsibilities

1. Meet tuition costs where possible.

2. Provide the usual assistance and amenities enjoyed by visiting faculty.

J. Host Campus Departmental Responsibilities

1. Assist the trainee in the development and pursuit of his program.

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
FACULTY RETRAINING PROGRAM

FACULTY RETRAINING APPLICATION

The applicant is asked to complete the questionnaire as fully as possible.

Name of Candidate:_____ Date:_____

Social Security Number:_____ Birth Date:_____

Academic Title:_____

Campus Address:_____ Campus Tel. No.:_____

Home Address:_____ Home Tel. No.:_____

Formal Education:

(Institution)	(Major)	(Minor)	(Degree)	(Date)

Academic Service (Answer Where Applicable):	(Currently)	(After Retraining)
Division		
Department or Discipline		
Program		
Sub-Discipline		

Academic and Professional Experience (Begin With Most Recent):

(Type)	(Years)

(Courses Applicant Has Taught)	(How Recently)

Name of Host Institution
for Retraining: _____

Name of Division/Department: _____
(Indicate Which)

Name of Division/Department Chairperson: _____

Address: _____

Reasons for Selecting This Institution and Division/Department:

Keeping in mind the various criteria in the guidelines, indicate as clearly as possible your proposed program for retraining. Include goals you wish to achieve, length of retraining, detailed study program by semester and overall relationship to goals, and utilization of summer.

Budget:

Expected Financial Assistance From Home Institutions:

Request for Retraining Program Financial Assistance (Carefully justify the amounts needed within the categories of relocation adjustments, course development support, trainee travel, and books and journals. Relocation Adjustments would include estimated expenses for food, housing, shipment of goods, etc., beyond those normally incurred while at the home campus. Course Development Support is designed primarily as a summer stipend for retrainees who are preparing new courses. Any probable travel related to retraining should be included under Trainee Travel with automobile mileage computed at 13¢ a mile. Books and Journals would include those needed as a part of retraining plus other materials and supplies.):

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
FACULTY RETRAINING PROGRAM

DEPARTMENTAL AND COURSE DATA FORM

This information should be completed either by the local administration or the department(s) involved:

Faculty-Student Statistics for Current Semester (Answer Where Applicable):

(Unit)	(None)	(No. of Faculty)	(FTE's Generated)
Present Division	_____	_____	_____
Present Department or Discipline	_____	_____	_____
Present Program or Sub-Discipline	_____	_____	_____
Division of Transfer	_____	_____	_____
Department or Discipline of Transfer	_____	_____	_____
Program of Transfer	_____	_____	_____
Sub-Discipline of Transfer	_____	_____	_____

How many FTE's is the candidate currently generating?_____

Courses Not Now Teaching Which Will Be Teaching as a Result of Retraining:

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____

Courses Now Teaching Which Might Benefit From Retraining:

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____

CHECK LIST FOR SUBMISSION OF LOCALLY-APPROVED APPLICATIONS TO THE PROJECT DIRECTOR

1. Completed Faculty Retraining Application.

2. Completed Departmental and Course Data Form.

3. Letter of recommendation from the home institution indicating:

   a. Reasons for supporting the candidate's application, particularly as they relate to the purposes for retraining spelled out in page 1 of the Suggested Guidelines for Application of Retraining.

   b. Approval of retraining by the candidate's current division/department.

   c. Approval of retraining by the division/department of transfer (where applicable).

   d. Funding the home institution intends to provide.

4. Letter of approval from the host campus of the candidate's retraining program.

5. Any other information that seems particularly relevent to the application.

Appendix B

State University of New York
Project for Faculty Retraining

GUIDELINES FOR APPLICATION OF MINI-GRANT RETRAINING

Dr. T. Nyquist
3-14-78

MINI-GRANT GUIDELINES

Mini-grants add an opportunity for short-term retraining in specific areas and are suited for groups of faculty as well as individuals. They complement the longer term grants already available through the FIPSE retraining project (see attached description).

A. Purpose

1. To permit one or more tenured faculty to receive retraining over a period either on their home campus or on another campus (preferably within the SUNY system) in areas of growing concern or increasing student demand. Proposals providing opportunity for faculty in low demand fields will be given preference.

2. To allow colleges to use such concepts as intensive workshops to retrain faculty on their own campuses without the added expense of relocation, extensive transportation demands, and the need for reduced teaching loads or sabbatical leave.

3. To provide an alternative to the more extensive retraining normally required of faculty.

B. Home Campus Administrative Responsibilities

1. Where deemed desireable, to establish programs of retraining which would assure applicants of adequate retraining over a brief period of time (one semester or less).

2. Establish procedures for the selection of candidates.

3. Assure cooperation of affected departments where departmental transfers are involved or the approval of the department where a faculty member wishes to shift from one sub-area to another.

4. Select one or more candidates for retraining during the summer or some part of the next academic year, following the Criteria for Selection of Candidates set forth below.

5. Submit trainee recommendations by May 15.

6. Meet tuition costs of successful candidates where necessary and possible.

7. Provide an annual written report summarizing the correspondence between initial campus expectations for the mini-grants and the actual outcome.

C. Home Campus Departmental Responsibilities

1. Mini-grant retraining would encompass such possibilities as joint assignment in one's current department and another department, teaching in an interdisciplinary program, or teaching in a different sub-

area within one's current discipline. The home department(s) involved should:

a. Assist the candidate in developing and implementing a program that will prepare him or her to meet the anticipated new responsibilities.

b. Spell out to the candidate specifically what these responsibilities will be.

c. Provide an evaluative report on the success of the trainee's study program six months after assumption of new responsibilities.

D. Trainee Responsibilities

1. Submit an application to the person or body on campus responsible for screening applications. Included should be a specific rationale for retraining, purposes for selecting a particular host institution (which could be your own campus), a detailed and thorough study program prepared in conjunction with the recipient department or program and with the relevant department(s) of the host campus, a financial request, and a current curriculum vitae. Keep in mind the Criteria for Selection of Trainees and the Financial Guidelines.

2. If accepted for retraining, follow the proposed study program, working closely with the department(s) of the host institution and with the recipient department or program of the home institution.

3. Upon completion of the study program, prepare a report assessing the degree to which the program has satisfied proposed goals. Other aspects of the program may also be evaluated, such as host departmental cooperation and institutional assistance.

4. Six months after completing retraining, provide a progress and evaluation report of application of retraining.

E. Criteria for Selection of Trainees

1. It is the presumption that applicants will meet the following criteria. Exceptions can be made, with each case judged on its merit.

a. Tenured members of faculty.

b. Membership in low or declining enrollment programs, departments or divisions.

c. Demonstrated interest in retraining in an allied academic area where enrollments have increased and/or where current staffing needs are unsatisfied.

d. Carefully planned program of study developed in consultation with those in the department or sub-area in which one will be working upon the completion of retraining.

F. Program of Study Guidelines

1. The planned program ideally should be one which can be accomplished within the equivalent of a semester or less.

2. The proposed program might be achieved during the summer, by a reduced teaching load during a semester, or by using the break between semesters.

3. Such a program could include participation in a special retraining workshop, courses for credit, audited courses, independent or guided study, research, and collection of materials and information.

G. Financial Guidelines

1. A candidate for retraining can apply for grant assistance in the following categories and up to the maximums noted below. Justification should be clearly indicated!

a.	Relocation Adjustments (applicable in instances where the applicant would find it necessary to move temporarily to the area of the host campus)	$1000.00
b.	Course Development Support	1000.00
c.	Trainee Travel (especially applicable where the candidate commutes to the host campus) . . .	500.00
d.	Books and materials	200.00

H. Guidelines for Selection of Host Campus

1. Normally retraining will be done at one of the SUNY units. This does not exclude the possibility of retraining outside the SUNY system.

2. Retraining may be provided on the home campus.

I. Host Campus Administrative Responsibilities

1. Meet tuition costs where possible.

2. Provide the usual assistance and amenities enjoyed by visiting faculty.

J. Host Campus Departmental Responsibilities

1. Assist the trainee in the development and pursuit of his program.

K. Application Forms

1. Those normally used for retraining.

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
FACULTY RETRAINING PROGRAM

FACULTY RETRAINING APPLICATION

The applicant is asked to complete the questionnaire as fully as possible.

Name of Candidate:_____ Date:_____

Social Security Number:_____ Birth Date:_____

Academic Title:_____

Campus Address:_____ Campus Tel. No.:_____

Home Address:_____ Home Tel. No.:_____

Formal Education:

(Institution)	(Major)	(Minor)	(Degree)	(Date)

Academic Service (Answer Where Applicable):	(Currently)	(After Retraining)
Division		
Department or Discipline		
Program		
Sub-Discipline		

Academic and Professional Experience (Begin With Most Recent):

(Type)	(Years)

(Courses Applicant Has Taught)	(How Recently)

Name of Host Institution for Retraining: _____

Name of Division/Department: (Indicate Which) _____

Name of Division/Department Chairperson: _____

Address: _____

Reasons for Selecting This Institution and Division/Department:

Keeping in mind the various criteria in the guidelines, indicate as clearly as possible your proposed program for retraining. Include goals you wish to achieve, length of retraining, detailed study program by semester and overall relationship to goals, and utilization of summer.

Budget:

Expected Financial Assistance From Home Institutions:

Request for Retraining Program Financial Assistance (Carefully justify the amounts needed within the categories of relocation adjustments, course development support, trainee travel, and books and journals. Relocation Adjustments would include estimated expenses for food, housing, shipment of goods, etc., beyond those normally incurred while at the home campus. Course Development Support is designed primarily as a summer stipend for retrainees who are preparing new courses. Any probable travel related to retraining should be included under Trainee Travel with automobile mileage computed at 13¢ a mile. Books and Journals would include those needed as a part of retraining plus other materials and supplies.):

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
FACULTY RETRAINING PROGRAM

DEPARTMENTAL AND COURSE DATA FORM

This information should be completed either by the local administration or the department(s) involved:

Faculty-Student Statistics for Current Semester (Answer Where Applicable):

(Unit)	(None)	(No. of Faculty)	(FTE's Generated)
Present Division			
Present Department or Discipline			
Present Program or Sub-Discipline			
Division of Transfer			
Department or Discipline of Transfer			
Program of Transfer			
Sub-Discipline of Transfer			

How many FTE's is the candidate currently generating?_____

Courses Not Now Teaching Which Will Be Teaching as a Result of Retraining:

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____

Courses Now Teaching Which Might Benefit From Retraining:

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____

CHECK LIST FOR SUBMISSION OF LOCALLY-APPROVED APPLICATIONS TO THE PROJECT DIRECTOR

1. Completed Faculty Retraining Application.

2. Completed Departmental and Course Data Form.

3. Letter of recommendation from the home institution indicating:

   a. Reasons [illegible] supporting the candidate's application, particularly as they relate to the purposes for retraining spelled out in page 1 of the Suggested Guidelines for Application of Retraining.

   b. Approval of retraining by the candidate's current division/department.

   c. Approval of retraining by the division/department of transfer (where applicable).

   d. Funding the home institution intends to provide.

4. Letter of approval from the host campus of the candidate's retraining program.

5. Any other information that seems particularly relevent to the application.

APPENDIX C - NAMES OF PARTICIPATING SUNY CAMPUSES

A. University Centers

SUNY Albany, 1400 Washington Avenue, Albany, New York 12222

SUNY Binghamton, Vestal Parkway East, Binghamton, New York 13901

SUNY Buffalo, 3435 Main Street, Buffalo, New York 14214

SUNY Stony Brook, Stony Brook, N. Y. 11794

B. University Colleges

SUC Brockport, Brockport, New York 14420

SUC Buffalo, 1300 Elmwood Avenue, Buffalo, New York 14222

New York State College of Human Ecology, Martha Van Rensselaer Hall, Ithaca, New York 14853

Empire State College, Coordinating Center, 2 Union Avenue, Saratoga Springs, N.Y. 12866

SUNY Maritime College, Fort Schuyler, Bronx, N. Y. 10465

SUC New Paltz, New Paltz, New York 12562

SUC Oneonta, Oneonta, New York 13820

SUC Oswego, Oswego, New York 13126

SUC Plattsburg, Plattsburg, New York 12901

SUC Potsdam, Potsdam, New York 13676

C. Community Colleges

Adirondack Community College, Glens Falls, New York 12801

Broome Community College, Binghamton, New York 13902

Cayuga County Community College, Franklin Street, Auburn, New York 13021

Clinton Community College, Plattsburg, New York 12901

Columbia-Greene Community College, Box 1000, Hudson, New York 12534

Corning Community College, Corning, New York 14830

Dutchess Community College, Pendell Road, Poughkeepsie, New York 12601

Genesee Community College, College Road, P.O. Box 718, Batavia, N. Y. 14020

Herkimer County Community College, Reservoir Road, Herkimer, N. Y. 13350

Hudson Valley Community College, 80 Vandenburg Avenue, Troy, New York 12180

C. Community Colleges (Continued

Jamestown Community College, 525 Falconer Street, Jamestown, New York 14701

Niagara County Community College, 3111 Saunders Settlement Road, Sanborn, N. Y. 14132

Orange County Community College, Middletown, N. Y. 10940

Schenectady County Community College, 77 Washington Avenue, Schenectady, N. Y. 12305

Suffolk County Community College, College Administrative Offices, 533 College Road, Selden, New York 11784

Sullivan County Community College, Loch Sheldrake, New York 12759

Tompkins-Cortland Community College, 170 North Street, Dryden, New York 13053

Ulster County Community College, Stone Ridge, New York 12484

Westchester Community College, 75 Grasslands Road, Valhalla, New York 10595

D. Agricultural and Technical Colleges

Canton Agricultural and Technical College, Canton, New York 13617

Cobleskill Agricultural and Technical College, Cobleskill, N. Y. 12043

APPENDIX D - HOST CAMPUSES FOR RETRAINING

A. Other SUNY Campuses

1. SUNY Albany, 1400 Washington Avenue, Albany, N. Y. 12222
2. SUNY Binghamton, Vestal Parkway East, Binghamton, N. Y. 13901
3. SUNY Buffalo, 3435 Main Street, Buffalo, New York 14214
4. SUC Cortland, Cortland, New York 13045
5. SUC Plattsburg, Plattsburg, New York 12901
6. SUNY Stony Brook, Stony Brook, N. Y. 11794

B. Other Institutions in New York State

1. Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, New York 11973
2. Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. 14853
3. Marist College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y. 12601
4. Max Weinreich Institute, 1046 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
5. New York University, New York, N. Y. 10003
6. Rochester Institute of Technology, Rochester, N. Y. 14623
7. Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y. 13210

C. Institutions Elsewhere in United States

1. Central Michigan University, Mt. Pleasant, Michigan 48859
2. United States Forest Service, Forest and Range Experimental Station, Tempe, Arizona 85281
3. University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts 01002
4. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109
5. University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska 68583
6. University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas 78712
7. University of Vermont, Burlington, Vermont 05401

D. Institutions Out-of-Country

1. Institute Fenix, Colonia Tlaltenango, Cuernavaca, Morelos, Mexico 102-B
2. Paris Institute Catholique, Paris, France

Appendix E

FACULTY RETRAINING GRANTS AWARDED

30, 1979

		Original Area	Area of Retraining
I. Approved Spring 1977			
C. C.	Dutchess Community College	Physical Education	Recreation
R. D.	SUC Plattsburg	English	Journalism
F. D.	Clinton Community College	European History	Anthropology and Geography
T. E.	Dutchess Community College	Sociology	Business Administration
N. G.	Dutchess Community College	Elementary Education	Speech and Dramatic Arts
R. M.	SUC Plattsburg	Elementary and Secondary Education	Reading Education
I. M.	SUC New Paltz	Latin American History	Economics and Sociology
A. M.	Hudson Valley Community College	German	Student Personnel
II. Approved Fall 1977			
H. M.	SUC Brockport	Oral Interpretation	Radio and Television
H. M.	SUC Brockport	German	French
W. M.	SUC Brockport	German	Spanish (English as a Second Language)
G. S.	SUC New Paltz	American History	Jewish Studies
A. S.	SUC Potsdam	Micro-Economics and Industrial Organization	Managerial Economics
A. W.	SUC Potsdam (funded, but was unable to pursue retraining, funding withdrawn).		
III. Approved Spring 1978			
A. E.	SUC Buffalo	Education	Consumer Studies and Home Economics
A. H.	Niagara County Comm. College	Mathematics	Computer Science & Data Processing
J. H.	SUC Brockport	Earth Science	Soil Science & Watershed Management
A. K.	SUC New Paltz	Physics	Geology
H. M.	SUC Buffalo	Health, Physical Education, Recreation	Gerontology
H. P.	SUC Brockport	French Literature	French Civilization
V. S.	SUC Plattsburg	French	French Civilization
K. S.	SUC Brockport	American History	Criminal Justice
R. S.	Niagara County Comm. Coll.	Art History/Life Drawing	Photography
P. S.	SUC Plattsburg	Physics	Energy Technology (Environmental Sciences)
S. V.	SUC Brockport (left SUNY system, funding withdrawn)		

IV.	Approved Summer 1978 (Mini-Grants		Original Area	Area of Retraining
	C. M.	Tompkins-Cortland Community College	Health and Recreation	Psychology
V.	Approved Fall 1978			
	J. C.[a]	SUC New Paltz	Secondary Education	Criminal Justice
	F. H.	SUC Potsdam	Secondary Education	Personnel and Human Resource Management
	J. H.	SUC Plattsburg	Elementary Education	Special Education
	B. K.	Broome Community College	Political Science	Business Law
	T. L.	SUC Plattsburg	Physics	Electronics
	D. M.	SUC Brockport	Mathematics	Computer Science
	T. N.	Genesee Community College	Mathematics	Data Processing (Business)
	R. O.	SUC Potsdam	Journalism	Mass Media (T.V.-Radio)
	J. R.	SUC Buffalo	Elementary Education	Business
VI.	Approved Spring 1979			
	R. L.	Cayuga County Community College	Biology	Geology

(a) Was approved for retraining, but no financial assistance from the program was involved, only campus assistance.

APPENDIX F - STATISTICAL SUMMARY 6/30/79

- Campuses participating - 4 university centers, 10 university colleges, 19 community colleges, 2 agricultural and technical colleges.
- Monies granted - $84,062.27 to 33 applicants.
- Average grant size - $2547.34.
- Variation in size - from $575.00 to $5227.32.
- Total applications - 77.
- Total approved - 36.
- Total funded - 33[a].
- Percentage funded - 43.
- 68% of submissions came from university colleges and 67% of the applicants funded.
- 30% of submissions came from community colleges and 33% of the applicants funded.
- The largest number, 46 percent, retrained or are retraining within the SUNY system.
- 29 percent or 10 have retrained out-of-state or out-of-country. Of two persons who went out-of-country, both were retraining in related language areas--one to Mexico, one to France.
- Largest percentage of applicants funded, 39 percent, fall within 35-39 age group.
- 24 percent of applicants furded have been full professors, 43 percent associate professors, and 33 percent assistant professors.
- 67 percent of the applicants funded had doctoral degrees, 30 percent masteral degrees, and 3 percent bachelors degrees.
- Out of total applicants, 19 or 25 percent were women. Of the 33 applicants funded, 8 or 24 percent were women.
- Race of applicants was not asked and thus there are no statistics.
- Of the 33 faculty who were involved in retraining, 12 percent (4) are totally shifting into new disciplines, 52 percent (17) are partially shifting into new disciplines, and 36 percent (12) are shifting partially or totally into new sub-areas of their current disciplines.

---

a. Of those faculty approved for retraining, three were not funded. One left the SUNY system and funding was withdrawn, one was unable to pursue retraining at the specified time, and the third received all his financial assistance from his college.

- The largest number of applicants funded have been in the Foreign Languages (6), Education (4) and History (4). Other areas well represented have been Physics (3), and Physical Education (3).

- Length of retraining has ranged from 3 weeks to 15 months, but with a mean average of about one semester.

- Thus far, of those who began retraining, none have dropped out of their retraining programs.

- Before applications are funded the department or departments which will be affected must be in agreement about the retrainee's new responsibilities. In only one instance has a department tried to renege after retraining has taken place.

Appendix G

November 1978

OUTSIDE EVALUATION

A Profile of Retraining in the SUNY System

prepared by
Harriet Hoffman, Ph.D.
Pennsylvania State College
Educational Services Trust Fund

The purpose of the SUNY retraining program is to provide flexibility for tenured faculty members in areas of declining enrollment by preparing them through retraining for re-assignment in related disciplines and subdisciplines of growing or high enrollment. The program is viewed as one alternative to retrenchment. It is designed to increase cooperation between SUNY units by encouraging faculty to carry out retraining on SUNY Colleges of Arts and Sciences and University Center Campuses.

During the week of October 2 - 6, 1978, a sample of ten faculty members who had retrained within the SUNY system participated in personal interviews. In addition, chairpersons and administrators familiar with an individual's retraining program were interviewed. The faculty members reside on three community college campuses and three colleges of arts and science located throughout New York State. Attached is a summary of data gathered from the interviews.

	INSTITUTION		DISCIPLINE		CIRCUMSTANCES			INITIATED IDEA		TIME SPENT RETRAIN.	LOCATION		LEVEL ACHIEVED		% TIME IN NEW AREA	PREPARATION PERCEIVED AS (BY FACULTY)			OVERALL PERCEPTIONS OF BENEFITS					
																			FACULTY			ADMINISTRATION		
	Community College	4 yr. Arts/Sc	Before	After	Lower Enroll.	Retrench-ment	Other	Self	Other		SUNY	Other	Degree	Non Degree		Inadq.	Adequate	Excell.	Positive	Mixed	Negative	Positive	Mixed	Negative
A	X		Speech-Public Speaking	Media	X			X		1 year		X	X MA		90		X		X			X		
B	X		Behav-ioral Science Socio.	Business Admin.	X			X		3 years part-time		X	X MBA		20		X		X			X		
C	X		Physical Educa-tion	Recre-ation			X		X Chair-person	1 semester		X		X	25		X		X			X		
D		X	History	Soci-ology	X	X		X		1 year and summer	X			X	10		X				X			X
E	X		History	Anthro-pology/ Geog-raphy	X				X Dean	2 years	X		X MA		40		X		X			X		
F		X	German	EFL English as For. Lang.	X				X Chair-person	1 month		X		X	50		X		X			X		
G	X		German	Academic Advising	X			X		1 year and 1 summer	X		X MA		100			X	X			X		
H		X	Speech/ Oral Interp.	Media/ Broad-casting			X	X		1 semes. full time		X		X audited	50		X		X			X		
I		X	German	French	X				X Chair-person	1 month		X		X	75		X			X		X		
J		X	Educa-tion/ English	Educa-tion/ Reading	X			X		1 semes. and 1 summer	X			X course-work	50		X		X				X	

Some conclusions which might be drawn from the data are as follows:

1. As one of several strategies for re-allocation of faculty in a time of declining enrollments, retraining does work. The benefits for both the college and the individual are generally agreed upon.

2. Most retraining programs do not involve dramatic career changes. Rather, they often involve re-orientation within a department or discipline (70% of population sampled), or training in a closely related field (30% of population sampled.)

3. Retraining is frequently self-initiated (60% of sample), or pursued by highly motivated individuals in response to the suggestion of departmental chairpersons or administrators (40% of sample). It is not a viable alternative for ridding departments of "dead wood". Faculty members interviewed had been encouraged to retrain by administrators, and were accepted in their new roles because of their reputations as good teachers.

4. The average retraining program is one year plus a summer. (The range of retraining for the sample was 1 month to 3 years.) More than half of the retrainees in this sample did not obtain degrees. The four who did were at the community college level.

5. Most retrained faculty feel adequately prepared to teach new courses as a result of their retraining programs. However, almost no one felt the same level of confidence and comfort experienced as a result of years of teaching in a discipline.

6. The range of new responsibilities tends to vary from 10% to 100% of an individuals time. Initially, most retrained faculty prefer to move into their new disciplines slowly, spending less than 50% of their time in the new area.

Some insights and patterns emerged as a result of the personal interviewing which might not otherwise have come to light.

1. Retraining programs work best when two criteria are met simultaneously: a) they fulfill an institution's need for flexibility in re-allocating faculty and b) they meet faculty members needs for personal and professional growth. Problems tend to arise when only one of these conditions is met. For example, a department re-assigns a faculty member who is not motivated to take a leave of absence to study, or a faculty member is motivated to retrain in a new sub-discipline but there is no need for additional personnel in this area.

2. The more support (both human and financial) faculty members receive for retraining at their institutions, the greater is the chance for a successful retraining program and transition to a new area. In a number of instances, chairpersons or deans served as mentors to faculty members. They provided emotional support while the faculty member was making a difficult career decision to leave his or her discipline. They also provided expertise and administrative support during and after the retraining period. Retraining was not successful in the instance where the faculty member received negative feedback and no administrative support.

3. There tends to be a dramatic difference between the viewpoints of administrators and faculty members toward the benefits of retraining. Administrators cite flexibility in re-assigning faculty as the primary benefit. They tend to be guarded in their enthusiasm for the program because it involves small numbers of faculty and is only a partial solution to their enrollment and fiscal problems. As a group, they do not seem fully aware of the opportunity for professional development and personal growth possible through retraining. Faculty members, on the other hand, cite the opportunities for personal and

professional growth and intellectual stimulation as the primary benefit. Increased job security and increased flexibility at the institution were mentioned as secondary outcomes. Faculty members were most aware of certain unexpected benefits. These included improved teaching ability; improved ability to relate to students as a result of being a student; increased level of participation in professional activities in the new discipline; development of ongoing, supportive relationships with individuals at the host institutions; improved self-esteem; and job offers from other colleges and outside academia.

4. A profile of the "typical retrainee" which emerged as a result of the ten interviews is as follows: the faculty member is a middle-aged man or women around 50 years. (The range of ages was from 30 - 51. Six out of ten were between 49 - 51). He/she is frequently single or divorced and therefore more mobile than married colleagues and probably more willing to take risks. Psychologically, the faculty member is a self starter. Most people either "jumped at the chance" to get retraining when they heard of the FIPSE grant, or had already begun training in areas they perceived as providing better professional opportunities.

5. Retraining works better on two year campuses than on four year campuses for several reasons. First, it is possible for a community college faculty member to get a second master's degree during a year long sabbatical or over a two year period, part time. The master's degree is the terminal degree at the community colleges and is viewed as adequate preparation for teaching. Second, the community colleges have large departments and divisions. Administrators have more flexibility in re-assigning faculty members within them. There are fewer turf problems among colleagues in departments. Fin-

ally, faculty members have not made an emotional investment in the Ph.D. They are more willing to acknowledge professional stagnation, and to do something about it -- through retraining and other career changes. At the four year colleges, on the other hand, administrators tend to believe that coursework below the Ph.D. level is not adequate preparation for teaching in baccalaureate programs. Some few had concerns about publications and limited opportunities for mobility outside the particular campus. These conservative attitudes are barriers to retraining not encountered on the two year campuses.

During the interviews, some suggestions were made for improving the SUNY program. These centered around administrative details and stipulations of the FIPSE grant. They include:

1. Making money available for tuition.
2. Providing the option for faculty to study outside the SUNY system (already being done to some extent).
3. Broadening the definition of retraining to include the shift from teaching to administration.

HH:amk

PSCESTF

10/78

APPENDIX H - ARTICLES AND PAPERS ON SUNY RETRAINING

ARTICLES PUBLISHED

"Faculty Retraining in Four States," AAHE Bulletin, Vol. 31, No. 2, October 1978.

"SUNY Faculty Retraining Program," Continuous Career Examination: Models for Examination. Sandra K. Palston (ed.). American Association of State Colleges and Universities, February 1979.

"State University of New York Training Project," Viewpoints in Teaching and Learning. Vol. 54, No. 4, October 1978.

PAPERS PRESENTED ON RETRAINING

Paper delivered at the Conference of Professional and Organizational Development, Airlie House, Washington, D.C., October 1976.

Paper delivered at the National Professional and Organizational Development Network Conference, Zion, Illinois, October 1977.

Paper delivered at the American Association for Higher Education National Conference on Higher Education, March 1978.

Paper delivered at the National Professional and Organizational Development Network Conference, Afton, Oklahoma, November 1978.

Paper delivered at the Community College Conference sponsored by NYSHI and AFT, Albany, New York, March 1979.

Paper delivered at the Faculty Retraining Workshop sponsored by the New Jersey Consortium on the Community College, Somerville, New Jersey, April 1979.

Paper delivered at the Association of Canadian Community Colleges Conference, Montreal, Canada, May 1979.

Volume 31, Number 2
October 1978

Published by the American Association for Higher Education

AAHE BULLETIN

IN BRIEF

- "Faculty Retraining in Four States," by Charles B. Neff, p. 1
- "On Increasing the Number of Women in Educational Administration," by Garry D. Hays, p. 1
- Trends and Findings from recent studies and reports, p. 2
- "Our 14,000 Colleagues in Business, Industry, and Government," a report on the ASTD conference by Carolyne Davis and Austin Dougherty, p. 7
- 1979 National Conference register of associated organizations, p. 9
- News from the Women's Caucus, p. 9
- HEATH Resource Center opens, p. 10

FACULTY RETRAINING IN FOUR STATES

By Charles B. Neff

Traditionally, individuals have decided when and if to shift scholarly fields as their academic interests have changed. Some persons have made very substantial mid-career changes – from physics to biology, from English to philosophy, from sociology to political science. But until recently there has been little expectation that the reasons for change should be other than individually motivated.

After a period of almost uncontrolled growth, many educational institutions find themselves with disciplines and departments that are over-staffed with faculty and under-enrolled with students. One possible solution is to dismiss faculty and hire new individuals in fields that show high demand.

Another possibility is to retrain faculty from one field to another (or, as is often the case, from one subfield to another), preserving accumulated knowledge while adding new capability. Four university systems – the State University System of Florida (Florida), the State University of New York (SUNY), the State University College of Pennsylvania (Pennsylvania), and the University of Wisconsin System (Wisconsin) – have accumulated considerable experience with faculty retraining. The programs in these universities are the more advanced examples of formal commitment to retraining.

Reasons for Initiating Faculty Retraining Projects

Florida – Grants were initiated to offset expenses of retraining tenured faculty members in disciplines which were, or would in the next few years be, relatively over-staffed.

SUNY – A program was initiated to

(Continued on 5)

ON INCREASING THE NUMBER OF WOMEN IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

By Garry D. Hays

Fundamental to increasing the number of women in administrative positions is an active commitment by the governing board and the chief executive officer. A passive expectation, occasional admonitions, publication of affirmative action policies, or assertions on vacancy announcements about being an equal opportunity employer are insufficient. Rather, commitment must be demonstrated in two fundamental ways: by example and through operating procedures. A predominantly male board that has hired only male presidents is not in a strong position to encourage its administrators to appoint women. Moreover, the commitment of a chief executive officer who makes predominantly male appointments and who continues to utilize traditional search procedures will be understandably suspect; the softness of such so-called commitment is inevitably communicated to others in the institution or system.

Setting Goals for Hiring

As important as example is, however, in communicating an expectation, a commitment to advancing women into administrative positions must be made operational. A place to begin is with a systematic approach to setting goals for hiring. Early in the movement for equal opportunity great emphasis was placed on affirmative action policies which usually included a statement of commitment, requirements that search committees be representative of women and minorities in the institution, and that vacancy notices be published in publications likely to reach a wide audience. Thus, beautifully worded policies were drafted, large sums of money were spent in placing advertisements, and institutions continued to make predominantly male appointments to administrative positions. Initially, few evaluated the effectiveness of the publications in actually producing more women applicants, and search committees – with a few women and minorities on them – continued to operate pretty much in the same manner; they were now simply able to demonstrate, upon offering the names of three white males to the appointing administrator, that it had "X" number of women applicants and had placed "Y" number of advertisements in so-called affirmative action publications. The total number of women in the institution may have increased somewhat, but not in each department or administrative unit and not in any

(Continued on 3)

Faculty Retraining
(*Continued from 1*)

allow tenured faculty in areas of sub- and declining enrollments to retrain in related disciplines and sub-disciplines of growing or high enrollment. The program was seen as a partial alternative to the retrenchment of faculty.

Pennsylvania – A special foundation, The Pennsylvania State College Educational Services Trust Fund, was established as a joint union/management venture in response to a retrenchment plan for the laying off of 82 faculty members from the 14 State-owned colleges and university. (The retrenchment was subsequently cancelled).

Wisconsin – An organized faculty retraining effort was developed as one of several means employed by the system in an effort to retrain tenured faculty designated for layoff. Eighty-eight tenured faculty were designated for layoff in 1974. A new program for faculty retraining emphasizing development and renewal has recently been initiated.

The Period Covered by the Faculty Retraining Program

Florida – The Florida retraining program is no longer in operation. It operated during the academic years 1974-75, 1975-76, and 1976-77.

SUNY – After a year of planning, a retraining program was initiated in the academic year of 1977-78. A second group of faculty is now being chosen for the program in the year 1978-79.

Pennsylvania – Retraining was supported on the 14 State-owned campuses during the spring and summer semesters of 1976, with a few programs carrying over into the fall of 1976 and the spring of 1977. A smaller retraining program has continued in 1978.

Wisconsin – The Wisconsin program divides into three distinct periods. During the first, 1973-76, the system supported the program. During the second, 1976-78, institutions supported limited retraining programs with their own resources. The third commenced in 1978, during which the system has received legislative funding for a broader faculty retraining program with funding shared by the system and the campuses.

Number of Persons in Retraining Programs

	1973-74	1974-75	1975-76	1976-77	1977-78	1978-79 (Est.)	Total
Florida		9	5	4			18
SUNY					13	15	28
Pennsylvania			11	4	3		18
Wisconsin	2	19	7	1	7	50	86
Total							150

Representative Retraining Programs

	Old (sub) Field	New (sub) Field
Florida	Graphic Arts	Photo Journalism
	Foods & Nutrition	Hospital Dietetics; Metrics in Food Preparation
	Pharmacy	Radiopharmacy
	Nutrition	Hospital Dietetics
	Social Studies Ed.	Language Education (Reading)
	Elementary Particle Physics	Medical Physics
	Behavioral Sciences	Communicology
	Health & Physical Ed.	Adaptive and Therapeutic Rec.
	Biology	Physical Education
	Automotive Tech.	Science & Tech.
	Systems Science	Computer Software; Business Applications
	Mathematics	Computer Science & Mathematics
	Elective Physical Ed.	Movement Science (Exercise Physiology)
SUNY	European History	Anthropology and Geography
	Physical Ed.	Recreation
	Sociology	Business Administration
	Elementary Ed.	Speech and Dramatic Arts
	German	Student Personnel Services
	Latin American History	Economics; Sociology
	English	Journalism
	German	English
Pennsylvania	History	Chemistry
	Psychology	Laboratory Education
	Philosophy	Psychiatry
	Philosophy	Humanistic Psychotherapy
	Mathematics	Computer Technology
	History	Communications

Process for Selecting Retrainees

Florida – Selection of retrainees was made by the Board of Regents office from slates of nominees presented by the respective university presidents.

SUNY – Guidelines were developed and circulated to campuses on the basis of which candidates were nominated to the central administration. An advisory committee, in the first year consisting of representatives of all campuses involved and in the second of selective campuses, made final recommendations on the basis of which participants were chosen.

Pennsylvania – Candidates have been selected for retraining through a grants competition. Proposals are initiated by faculty members in consultation with appropriate departments or units, then reviewed by the campus administration and the director of the Educational Services Trust Fund, with final decisions made by the trustees of the Fund.

Wisconsin – Selection procedures have varied. During the initial phases, when layoffs were paramount, each case was considered on an individual basis and the availability of a guaranteed position after retraining was a controlling factor. Each retraining program was negotiated between a representative of the system and the separate campuses. During the second period, selection of candidates was almost totally decentralized, though the system made a strong effort to encourage each campus to make explicit its changing educational needs. During the third phase, which is currently commencing, recommendations will be made at the institutional level and proposals will finally be accepted by the system administration. (A system-wide task force may be established for the review of these proposals.)

Costs of Retraining

Florida – Salary plus $3,000 (average) for general support.

SUNY – Salary plus tuition waivers (within SUNY only) plus $2,700 (average) for travel, books, etc. (range $1,500-$4,100).

Pennsylvania – Salary plus $2,000 (average) for tuition, books, travel (range $150-$7,200).

Wisconsin – Salary plus tuition.

Average Length of Retraining

Florida – In most cases, one year.

SUNY – Three weeks to fifteen months, with an average of between one and two semesters.

Pennsylvania – An average of one semester, with a range of one semester to two semesters plus a summer.

Wisconsin – A usual length of two semesters, with two semesters and two summer sessions as the longest program. There have been a few single semester programs.

Financing of Retraining

Florida – Salaries have been paid by the campuses, with additional expenses appropriated from State funds.

SUNY – Salaries have been paid by the campuses. Tuition waivers have been granted within SUNY by the University and special expenses paid by a Federal grant.

Pennsylvania – Campuses have paid for released-time, sabbatical, or special administrative leaves. The Educational Services Trust Fund has made grants for tuition, books, and travel.

Wisconsin – In the first phase, the system administration financed a total effort, although faculty salaries were technically charged to institutional budgets. During the second phase, institutions underwrote the costs from their own budgets. In the third phase, institutions and the system administration will share costs jointly.

Where Has Retraining Occurred?

Florida – Most programs have been completed at out-of-state institutions. Fewer have been completed at senior institutions within the State.

SUNY – The SUNY/FIPSE project has been based on the assumption that retraining could occur within State University of New York. This has been true in over one-half of the cases. Other retraining has occurred at out-of-state universities or at private institutions in New York.

Pennsylvania – Most retraining programs have occurred at private or State-related institutions within Pennsylvania. About one-third of the programs have occurred out-of-state or out-of-country.

Wisconsin – By the nature of the grants available, all retraining occurred within the State of Wisconsin or in Minnesota institutions which have signed a reciprocity compact for tuition. In a few cases, individuals elected out-of-state institutions and had to pay their own tuition.

Working Conclusions

From the experience derived thus far in the four retraining projects described above, we have derived the following working conclusions. They are called working conclusions because they still have to be further tested by time and by more careful evaluation. They do seem to us to be the basis for further development of faculty retraining projects.

(1) Faculty retraining does work. We need not be conservative or afraid in suggesting it as one of several strategies for institutional and individual change, which collectively may provide higher education in America with a more viable future.

(2) No new program begins without misunderstanding as to purpose and some overt resistance. Faculty retraining is no exception. There is still some degree of suspicion about whether it is not a euphemism for layoff, retrenchment and budget cutback. No one particularly likes the name, but there seems to be no better substitute. Over time, it is probable that faculty retraining, like the term faculty development before it, may gain acceptance through use.

(3) Faculty retraining programs will not begin without some commitment to retraining in principle and without resource investment in planning for it. It takes time for people to absorb the positive potential of limited faculty retraining and to endorse it. The support of a staff or staff persons to discuss desirable outcomes of faculty retraining is a vital first investment. There is no substitute for person-to-person contact in developing retraining plans and for laying the groundwork upon which useful retraining can be built.

(4) Financial exigency is a powerful motivator. Without it, all but a few faculty members are unlikely to accept retraining and its purposes as a legitimate form of professional development. But if financial exigency sensitizes individuals to the potential for faculty development, it cannot be the principal justification for it. Faculty retraining can be not only quantitatively crucial, i.e., moving human and other resources from low demand to high demand areas, but it can be qualitatively crucial as well. Program improvement can also accrue as a result. Most importantly, individuals can get a new lease on life.

(5) It is important in planning retraining programs to identify fields rather than individuals. Retraining will not work as a draconian measure that will force a person to do something he or she would not be willing to do otherwise. By indicating opportunities rather than requirements, individuals who are interested and adventuresome enough will make use of those opportunities.

(6) Retraining is not a means for doing away with or improving bad teachers. Usually the persons who are willing to consider retraining are those who are already quite secure and who might engage in modes of effective professional development, even without a retraining project. Their willingness to move from one field or sub-field to another removes financial and other pressures, which then makes it possible for other forms of beneficial educational change to occur in a less constricted atmosphere.

(7) Retraining works best in a multi-institutional framework. Like many programs, retraining seems to benefit from being a group activity in which individuals who are in the project can communicate with one another and provide support. Use of a multi-campus setting also allows institutions, collectively, to make their educational resources available for retraining; there can be savings in program costs through tuition waivers.

(8) Retraining of tenured faculty members – statistically, most of them are likely to be established, white and male – could be viewed as conflicting with affirmative action goals. Such would be the case if retraining became an extensive program. The likelihood of that occurring is slight. On the more positive side, if faculty retraining allows academic programs to become more viable, more attractive to students, and educationally more effective, positions may actually be saved overall and they could become filled, in part, through affirmative action programs.

For further information, contact:

State University of Florida System
Dr. William Wharten, Director of Academic Programs for Florida Board of Regents
State University of Florida
107 W. Gaines Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32304

State University of New York
Dr. Charles B. Neff, Provost for Academic Programs
S 301A State University Plaza
Albany, New York 12246

Dr. Thomas E. Nyquist, Coordinator for Faculty Retraining
3 Hohmann House
SUC New Paltz
New Paltz, New York 12562

State University College of Pennsylvania
Dr. Harriet Hoffman, Executive Director Pennsylvania State College College Trust Fund
240 No. 3rd Street
Suite 701
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17101

University of Wisconsin System
Dr. Steven Karges, Academic Planner
University of Wisconsin System
Van Hise Hall
Madison, Wisconsin 53706

viewpoints in teaching and learning

this issue:

Inservice Training— the Future of Professional Education

Thomas M. Stephens and A. Carol Hartman
Guest co-editors

Journal of the School of Education
Indiana University
Volume 54, Number 4, October, 1978

Contents

From the Editor

Inservice Education: Its Murky Past and Uncertain Future 1
Thomas M. Stephens and A. Carol Hartman

Preservice Education Trains Attitudes for Inservice
Virginia H. Lucas

A Rationale for Training of Teacher Educators
Thomas M. Stephens

Perceived Inservice Needs Among Elementary Teachers
Gary M. Ingersoll and Ruth Ann Schneider

Using Telecommunication Systems for Delivering Inservice Training
Howard Blackhurst

A Systems Approach to Inservice Education
Larry A. Magliocca and Judith A. Magliocca

The State Department's Role in Local Inservice Programs
Joseph E. Fisher

A Cooperative Approach to Inservice Training
John O. Cooper and Kenneth P. Hunt

A District-Wide Model for Teacher Renewal
Albert Mamary

The School Study Council: A Model for an Inservice Delivery System
Donald P. Anderson and Guy M. Sconzo

Inservice Education Needs of Education Deans
Frederick R. Cyphert and Nancy L. Zimpher

State University of New York Faculty Retraining Project
Thomas E. Nyquist

...ing

...f theory, research and ...ractice, to ... preschool ... through ... arly, in January, April, July and ... in Education (ERIC), and in ...ity Microfilms. ...

... year: $20, two years: $3... three ... years: $36, three years. Single ... as other editorial and business ... Teaching and Learning, Publica... Bloomington, Indiana 47401. Second ... Number 077220.

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK FACULTY RETRAINING PROJECT

Thomas E. Nyquist

During a time of depressed economy and reduced faculty mobility from one institution to another, universities and colleges must devise strategies that sustain current programs while allowing for change. Experience gained in the State University of New York Project on Faculty Retraining suggests that a humane and effective way is to allow opportunities for tenured faculty in areas of low and declining enrollment to retrain in related disciplines and sub-disciplines of growing or high enrollment. The SUNY project currently involves 27 campuses, which includes 3 university centers, 8 university colleges, 14 community colleges, and 2 agricultural and technical colleges. Applications funded have reflected a wide spectrum of disciplines, designated institutions for retraining, age and professional level of retrainees, and length of retraining. Costs have been modest.

Keeping in mind economic conditions and the dramatically reduced faculty mobility from one institution to another, university and college administrators must devise strategies not only to sustain current programs at a respectable level of quality, but also to allow for change. Many such institutions, with reduced budgets and high tenure ratios in traditional departments and programs, are finding it increasingly difficult to maintain excellence while accommodating new and high demand initiatives. A humane and effective way to sustain quality programs is by allowing opportunities for tenured faculty in areas of low and declining enrollment to retrain in related disciplines and sub-disciplines of growing or high enrollment.

Toward this end within the State University of New York (SUNY), the SUNY Project on Faculty Retraining was established on July 1, 1976, on a pilot basis with monies provided by the Fund for the Improvement of Post Secondary Education (FIPSE) of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The first year (1976-77) was devoted to developing the project and selecting candidates who would retrain during part or all of the 1977-78 academic year. Participating campuses were initially limited to 12 SUNY campuses in the northeastern part of New York state: seven community colleges, one agricultural and technical college, three state university colleges, and one university center.

In March of 1977 a first group of five men and three women were selected for 1977-78 retraining from a total of 11 applications approved at the campus level. The selection was done by an Advisory Committee consisting of administrative representatives from each of the campuses in the pilot area, plus the project director and the project coordinator. The candidates were awarded grants encompassing the categories of relocation, course development, trainee travel, and books and materials. The grants varied in size from $1,550 to $4,104.40 but averaged $2,688.30. (Total funding for retrainees is approximately $40,000 a year, with a maximum of $5,400 for any one candidate.) In addition, home campuses provided assistance of up to one semester at full salary or two semesters at half salary. Where candidates did their retraining within the SUNY system tuition waivers were also made available.

The candidates were from the general disciplines of education, English, history, foreign languages, physical education, sociology, and student personnel. Four were scheduled to retrain at SUNY units within the pilot area, one at another SUNY unit, two at private universities in New York state, and two at universities in Michigan and Massachusetts. Retraining periods varied in length from 3 to 15 months, and averaged slightly less than two semesters.

On the basis of experience in the pilot areas, a decision was made in May of 1977 to expand the retraining area to include all interested campuses within the SUNY system, allowing them the opportunity to submit applications. Letters were sent to all the SUNY campuses not previously involved. Fifteen additional campuses indicated an interest in taking part, raising the total to 27 campuses. These consist of 14 community colleges, 2 agricultural and technical colleges, 1 extension college, 7 four-year colleges, and 3 university centers.

In August of 1977, campuses were invited to submit applications for further candidates to retrain during the spring and summer of 1978. Twelve applications were received and reviewed by a new Advisory Committee comprising the project director, project coordinator, and 10 administrators representing a cross-section of the kinds of campuses involved and their geographic distribution. Five applicants received funding, which varied in size from $575.00 to $5,227.32, with an average of $2,034.06.

The candidates were from the disciplines of speech, foreign languages, history, and economics. In each case their intent was to pursue new areas within these disciplines. Locations for retraining included another SUNY unit, a language institute in New York City, a university in Michigan, and two institutions outside the U.S. having ties with the SUNY system—Institute Fenix in Morelos, Mexico, and the Institute Catholique in Paris. Scheduled retraining periods were of a generally shorter duration than previously to fit within the remainder of the 1977-78 fiscal year. Therefore the retraining programs for these candidates varied from three weeks to eight months, with an average of approximately a semester. Out of 23 applications, 13 grants were awarded for 1977-78.

Reflecting the expansion of the retraining program, 28 applications were reviewed by the Advisory Committee in the first round for 1978-79. Out of this number 12 eventually were funded. As in previous instances, the successful applications constituted a wide spectrum of retraining modes. The candidates were from the disciplines of behavioral and humanistic studies, earth sciences, history, mathematics, physics, art, foreign languages, physical education, and the related area of health, education, and recreation. Intended foci of retraining included anthropology, consumer studies and home economics, criminal justice, computer science, environmental studies, geology, recreation and leisure, and related areas within their current disciplines, i.e. art, foreign languages, physical education, and health, education, and recreation. Six intended to retrain within the SUNY system, three at other New York institutions and three out of state. Size of grants varied from $1,731.35 to $4,733, with a mean average of $3,215.96 – somewhat higher than previously.

To be eligible for grants, faculty must be tenured members of low or declining enrollment departments; their requests for retraining must be in areas where campus need has increased, is increasing, or is anticipated to increase (and staffing is inadequate); their proposed program must have the approval of the affected department(s) and the administration; and there must be indication that they will be accepted for retraining by the host institutions. Factors included in judging individual applications are: level of the candidate's commitment to his area of retraining, the intended degree of retraining, the relationship between this and the level of financial assistance sought, the relationship between the planned program and anticipated outcome, and the justification for selecting a particular institution for retraining.

Summary statistics on the first three rounds of applications indicate the following: While the largest number of colleges involved in the program are the community colleges, the largest number of applications have come from the four year colleges, i.e. the university colleges (see Table 1). But given that the university colleges have considerably larger faculties, the ratio of applications is less skewed than it might first appear. Nonetheless, faculty from participating university college campuses have been more active in seeking retraining. One factor would seem to be the more frequent existence on such campuses of an administrative office responsible for faculty training and development. Applications from agricultural and technical colleges have been almost nil, reflecting the fact that student enrollments have held up well in these institutions and in most of their departments. A lack of applications has been characteristic of the university centers as well. Here the factors would seem to be at least two-fold.

Enrollments have generally continued to be good, and, unlike most of the colleges in the SUNY system, the university centers will actually have more faculty lines in 1978-79 than they did the previous year. Furthermore, there is an apparent elitist factor functioning, with the feeling that it is not possible for a teacher to adequately retrain in another area, or even proper to attempt to do so. Therefore, 96% of all applications have come from the university colleges and community colleges, with more than two-thirds monopolized by the university colleges. Application funding is reflective of this, as Table 1 indicates.

Table 1
Participating Campuses, Submissions and Approvals
Through March 1978

	In the Project	Submissions	Approvals
University Centers	3 (11%)	1 (2%)	0
University Colleges	8 (30%)	35 (69%)	18 (72%)
Community Colleges	14 (52%)	14 (27%)	7 (28%)
Agricultural and Technical Colleges	2 (7%)	1 (2%)	0
Total	27 (100%)	51 (100%)	25 (100%)

It is interesting as well to note the host institutions. In more than two-fifths of the cases, these are SUNY institutions (see Table 2), most commonly the university centers. An additional one-fourth consist of other institutions in New York state. The statistics are a result of two factors in particular: (1) the number of colleges and universities available within the state, and (2) a policy of encouraging candidates to make use of local facilities, particularly those within SUNY—both to hold down costs of relocation and/or transportation, and to encourage cooperation between SUNY units.

Table 2
Host Campuses for Retraining

	Number	Percent
SUNY	11	46
Other New York	6	25
Out-of-State	7	21
Out-of-Country	2	8
Total	26[a]	100

[a]The total approved applications were 25, but one application fell into two categories.

It is also relevant to consider who is training and in what area. The average age of retrainees at the time of application has been 41, but with a variation in age from 29 to 58. Oddly enough, the largest number, roughly two-thirds, fall in the age brackets of 35-39 and 45-49 (see Table 3), although it is unclear why the majority of trainees are of these ages. In addition, retraining has the characteristic of [illegible] faculty of varying professional and degree levels, giving lie to the

contention that more senior faculty are unwilling to consider new teaching alternatives (see Table 4).

Table 3
Age at Time of Application for Retraining

Age	Number
25-29	1
30-34	4
35-39	8
40-44	2
45-49	8
50-54	0
55-59	2
Total	25

Eight of the 25 successful applicants (32%) have been women. This is significantly higher than the percentage of women among the teaching faculty with the SUNY system (which is 21% in institutions other than community colleges and 31% among the community colleges). The number in retraining would seem to be a reflection, at least in part, of the general demise of foreign languages where traditionally the opportunities for women have been greater.

Table 4
Education Attained and Professional Level

	B.A. B.S.	M.A. M.S.	Ph.D. Ed.D.
Assistant Professor	1	5	4
Associate Professor	0	2	8
Professor	0	0	5
Total	1	7	17

The retraining application forms contain no questions on either racial or ethnic background. As a result, there are no reliable statistics on the number of minority candidates for retraining. The number is probably small, given that the retraining

program is designed for tenured faculty. With the fairly recent nature of minority recruitment, a considerable percentage would not yet be tenured.

Thus far, more than two-thirds (68%) of the faculty involved in retraining have come from the areas of foreign languages, history, physical education and related activities, physics, and speech. (See Table 5 for specific information on area and extent of retraining.) A number of funding requests have been received from faculty in education, but only one has been approved. Part of the problem has been the failure to provide demonstrable data that the areas in which retraining is being sought have, or are likely to have, significant student demand.

Almost half of all applicants receiving funding are, or will be, retraining in different sub-areas of their current discipline. Others are pursuing retraining with the goal of shifting partially into a new discipline. Only a handful have programs with the end goal of transferring totally into a new discipline. Retraining, therefore, has had two thrusts of roughly equal significance: to provide a stimulus for new directions within existing disciplines, and to provide personnel on a part-time basis in related disciplines where there is an existing or perceived need.

The costs of retraining have been modest. Sixteen candidates were funded out of 1977-78 project monies at an approximate expense to the retraining project of $60,000, which includes administration. This is an average of $3,750 per candidate. In addition, there are varying indirect costs to participating institutions in such categories as sabbaticals, other leaves with pay, released time, reduced teaching loads, and tuition.

It is too early to definitively evaluate the success of retraining, since few of the candidates have yet completed their programs. However, the results thus far are promising. Of the initial eight candidates for 1977-78, none have fallen seriously behind schedule in their retraining. Most have either been on target or ahead. All have found cooperation of the host institutions to be excellent or satisfactory.

Three persons have completed their retraining and are back on their home campuses. Of these, one feels that the course work he took was directly applicable to the new responsibilities he was assuming in recreation, and anticipated no problems in shouldering such responsibilities. Another who did his retraining in reading education believes that the objectives originally established were met "to a high degree," and anticipates that the retraining he received will permit him to make an increased contribution to his campus. The third is an English professor who did concentrated work in journalism during the summer of 1977, returned in the fall to teach in both areas, and recently submitted a six month report. In the report he notes that interest in the new journalism offerings "has not been lacking," with 45 students trying to enroll in his newspaper writing class this past spring, though enrollment was restricted to 20 students. He taught two journalism courses during the 1977-78 academic year, is teaching a further course this summer, and anticipates teaching four journalism courses during the 1978-79 academic year.

Additionally, one of the five candidates approved during the Fall of 1977, a German professor, has completed his concentrated retraining program in Span-

Table 5
Area and Extent of Retraining

A. Total transfer to new discipline (3 - 12%)

Behavioral and Humanistic Studies	Student Personnel
Foreign Languages (German)	Business
Sociology	Consumer Studies and Home Economics

B. Partial shift to new discipline (11 - 44%)

Earth Sciences	Recreation and Leisure
English	Journalism
Foreign Languages (German)	Anthropology
Foreign Languages (German)	English as a Second Language
Foreign Languages (German)	Foreign Languages (French)
History (American)	Criminal Justice
History (European)	Anthropology and Geography
History (Latin American)	Sociology and Economics
Mathematics	Computer Science
Physics	Environmental Studies
Physics	Geology

C. Partial shift to different sub-area within discipline (11 - 44%)*

Art (Art History/Life Drawing)
Economics (Industrial)
Education (Secondary)
Foreign Languages (French - Language and Literature)
Foreign Languages (French - Literature)
History (American)
Physical Education (Athletics)
Physical Education (Health, Education and Recreation)
Speech (Oral Interpretation and Speech)
Speech (Public Address)
Art (Art Photography)
Economics (Managerial)
Education (Reading)
Foreign Languages (French - French Civilization)
Foreign Languages (French - French Civilization)
History (Jewish)
Physical Education (Sports Management)
Physical Education (Recreation)
Health, Education and Recreation (Recreation for the Aging)
Speech (Communication)
Speech (Communication)

*All of those listed will continue to teach some classes in their current area of specialization.

ish and has submitted an initial report. He states that his experience was "excellent."

> I learned a great deal of Spanish: especially the preterites, subjunctives, and the curious uses of the reflexive—the latter revealing the soul of the language and a striking cultural difference in attitudes between North Americans and Latin Americans. All this knowledge and other aspects have already been put to good use in teaching English to speakers whose dominant language is Spanish.

He further states that his experience had contributed to a major decision on his future plans, which now include efforts to set up a skill's center for English as a Foreign Language.

Evaluations requested from campus administrations have been slow in coming, but those received are positive. A report from one of the community colleges states in part:

> Our expectations have been more than met. Not only has Mrs. --- enrolled in courses, but she has completed them with a straight "A" record. By careful planning and extra work, she will complete her Masters degree program this spring—which is well ahead of her original schedule. In addition, she has already made innovations in our program which have been helpful. . . . As a direct result of her retraining program Mrs. --- revised our orientation course. We are pleased with these revisions and believe it will materially aid students to define their goals and thus to improve their study habits and ultimately reduce student attrition.

As a result of decisions made during 1977 and implemented this past spring, the SUNY retraining project now offers through existing funding the additional option of mini-grants. The purpose of such grants is threefold:

1. To permit one or more tenured faculty members to receive retraining over a short period either on their home campus or on another campus in areas of growing concern or increasing student demand. Preference would be given to faculty in low demand fields.

2. To allow colleges to use such concepts as intensive workshops to retrain faculty on their own campuses without the added expense of relocation, extensive transportation demands, and the need for reduced teaching loads or sabbatical leave.

3. To provide an alternative to the more extensive retraining normally required of faculty.

The deadline for initial applications was May 15, 1978, with 11 received. How many will be funded is still unclear.

The experience of the SUNY project suggests that retraining in its various forms is a desirable and workable approach to meeting new programs and demands under circumstances of reduced resources and high tenure ratios. It provides a reasonable and humane alternative to retrenchment of underutilized faculty (with the resultant trauma to individuals and campuses) and offers needed flexibility for

colleges and universities. In addition, for some faculty it is revitalizing, providing new career alternatives, which they find exciting.

Thomas E. Nyquist, Ph.D., is project coordinator, Statewide Project on Faculty Retraining, State University of New York at New Paltz.

TAKING INSERVICE TRAINING INTO THE CLASSROOM

Denzil Edge and Albert H. Fink

Planning and developing field-based directed inservice training programs requir a great deal of time and effort. This paper outlines and discusses the variables o developing and conducting inservice programs that involve cooperative inservic training efforts on the part of the universities and school districts. Specific exam ples of field based inservice programs are outlined in the paper.

The continuous growth and changes in education call daily for new st[illegible] theories. Rapid changes in the field of special education have influenced th continued need for staff development and emphasized the need to provide new modes of delivering inservice training to educators of the handicapped. However the lack of resources and effective low cost inservice training models are two variables that will affect the provisions for inservice training to their staff by th local school districts.

Tyler (1971), Stephens (1973), and Cooper (1975) are among the researcher who have investigated the variables of effective models for delivering inservi training skills to educators. Tyler conducted a longitudinal study of the effects inservice training on teachers to implement new ideas. Tyler found that teache were more likely to put new ideas into practice if they had been involved in t functional processes of the inservice training.

Stephen's investigation of the effects of functional inservice training on han capped children indicated that teachers' behaviors toward instruction were influ enced by their active involvement in the learning process. Changes in th teachers' behavior were found in turn to influence change in their pupils' ac demic and social behavior.

The effects of the functional inservice training model on special education w studied recently by Cooper who found that the functional inservice training mo was most effective in delivering specific training skills to educators of han capped children.